



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

known exhibit the spirit of some of our public men. The letters from France and Prussia which he also prints show that, if we had kept the men and war had followed, we should have had no sympathy in Europe; his authorities hardly justify the conclusion that in case of war it is well-nigh certain we should have had the Czar as an ally, still less that a Russian admiral would have reported to the President for duty. Lord Russell's reply to Mr. Seward is an integral part of the case of the Trent; and Mr. Harris's comments on the course of the British government make a suitable close to his book. His preceding criticisms on Mr. Seward's despatch are not to be accepted without a more thorough examination than is here possible, and his general conclusions (p. 265) are certainly open to question as statements of the results of this case. (See Dana's *Wheaton*, pp. 644-661, note.)

Mosby's Rangers: A Record of the Operations of the Forty-third Battalion Virginia Cavalry, from its Organization to the Surrender, from the Diary of a Private, supplemented and verified with Official Reports, etc. By JAMES J. WILLIAMSON, of Company A. (New York: Ralph B. Kenyon. 1896. Pp. xii, 510.)

NONE of the brave men who fought through our civil war is qualified to write its final history; yet whoever is able should deem it a duty to jot down the facts which alone can lend local color to the work of the future historian. With characteristic national patience, the German general-staff has compiled an unprejudiced narrative of the War of 1870; but in America we are not so fortunate. Though there is no lack of even-handed treatment of the subject, the majority of our war-books lean markedly to one or the other side; and despite the glamour environing Mosby, the volume before us is somewhat marred by its unconscious bias. War on the large scale is a universally engrossing topic; the operations of small war must be narrated with exceptional dash to ensure an audience beyond the immediate personal circle; and this book will be chiefly read by those who served on the outskirts of the Virginian armies.

John Singleton Mosby was a born partisan. In 1861 he was twenty-eight years old, a college-bred lawyer, a man of quiet character, gentle though firm, cool and daring, and an unusual judge of men. Our author describes him as "a rather slender, but wiry-looking young man of medium height, with keen eyes and pleasant expression." During the first two years of the war he played but a modest part, awhile in the Old Capitol prison; nor until June, 1863, does he appear in a masterful rôle on the Virginia theatre of operations. His habitat, "Mosby's Confederacy," was a quadrangle between the Blue Ridge and Bull Run Mountains, whose debouches lay at the four corners—Manassas, Thoroughfare, Snicker's and Aldie Gaps. His troops were farmers, many of whom had

suffered at the hands of the United States troops ; they were called together for a raid by couriers ; they dispersed after the event ; any Virginian would shelter and feed them. Though they were regularly mustered in the Confederate army and though Mosby reported directly to J. E. B. Stuart and later to Gen. Lee, we Federals persisted in calling them guerillas, bushwhackers, freebooters, and sought to deny them the rights of the soldier who served in the ranks. Yet it is doubtful if war was ever conducted by an invaded population without recourse to irregulars—*Freischützen*, *francs-tireurs*, *Cossacks*—doubtful if conflict was ever freer from vandalism.

From his "Confederacy" Col. Mosby sallied forth at intervals of a few days or weeks, and by his intimate knowledge of the *terrain*, the aid of the country people, his exceptional speed, and his power of getting work out of his men and horses, he created for himself an importance quite beyond his actual power. He cut out army trains, burned bridges, pounced on sleeping camps, waylaid scouting parties, wrecked trains and captured paymasters with funds, rode into towns and took general officers prisoners in their beds, attacked cavalry columns with a mere handful of men, and generally played havoc with the minor operations of our armies. No wonder that his boldness and skill made him a Southern hero and Northern plague. Yet it savors of extravagance to herald him as the dread of Grant and Sheridan, as a factor in their problem overriding Lee and Early. As Hannibal's Numidians pestered the Roman legions ; as the Austrian Pandours more than once upset old Frederick's best laid plans ; so Mosby's brilliant success was won because the conditions had bred for us no body of men which could play his game. This was all : *Æsop's* gad-fly all but drove the lion crazy. Excellent chronicle as is Mr. Williamson's book, in this it lacks perspective : that it has just a trifle too much of the "we did it all" spirit. And yet the author is fair according to his light, admits occasional defeat gracefully, is not offensive in his accusations of "barbarities" committed by the Union troops, and verifies his statements by copious footnote extracts from the *War Records*. Still, when one finds that it is "nothing contrary to the usage of War" for Mosby to wreck a train and "kill and wound a large number" of our people, but that it is "brutal conduct" deserving retaliation for us to arrest some Confederate citizens, and make them ride on future trains as a deterrent, one is tempted to smile the honest obliquity of the author.

If Mosby was an irregular *beau sabreur* of pure water, so were his men brave, devoted, skilful and enterprising. They covered the country from Gordonsville to Gettysburg, from the Shenandoah to the lower Potomac, and left their impress wherever they went, in distinctly inverse ratio to their numbers. They were naturally horsemen as our men were not ; they left sabre and carbine behind and rode at the enemy with their six-shooters ; and their heavy percentage of loss testifies to their fighting capacity. In line of battle, however, they would not have counted for much—until they learned their trade. They did precisely

what New England farmers did a hundred years ago, and would do again—no more, no less.

The two hundred portraits, both Union and Confederate, are interesting as giving occasion to compare the Northern and Southern soldier's looks and attire, as well as to gauge the difference between the outward man of to-day and him of a generation past. The inward man varies only as he gains (or loses) by civilization.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

Greek Oligarchies: Their Character and Organization, by Leonard Whibley. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896. Pp. viii, 212.) The author is a careful student of Aristotle's *Politics*, as may be inferred from his interesting treatment (Ch. I.) of Aristotle's classification of the forms of government, (Ch. IV.) of the varieties of aristocracy and oligarchy from Aristotle's standpoint and with historical illustrations, and (Ch. V.) of magistracies, councils, and assemblies as elements of oligarchic constitutions. These chapters form a useful contribution to Aristotelian literature; but the entire treatise is vitiated by the author's failure to distinguish fact from theory and by his lack of acquaintance with Grecian history. For instance, his statement that the names of the Attic γένη are all patronymic is a serious blunder; and his speculations as to the φρατρίαι and γένη, in which he follows Fustel de Coulanges, find little support in present-day research. Some credit is due him for his use of the comparative method; yet his comparisons are often superficial: there is more that is misleading than instructive in his analogy between the Attic peasants of Solon's time and the Laconian Helots. Sometimes he contradicts himself, as in his treatment of the Homeric assembly; sometimes he offers theories long antiquated, *e. g.*, that a time was when the common freemen were constitutionally exempt from military service. He settles unsettled questions with one bold dash of the pen—has "many reasons" for a view, but refuses to give one, although his reader would be grateful to him for a little light. In the historical parts of his work in general the author does not represent the best recent scholarship. He has read Gilbert, *Griechische Staatsalterthümer* II, carefully, but is unacquainted with such works as Busolt's *Griechische Geschichte* I. 2, Beloch's *Griechische Geschichte* I., and Wilamowitz-Möllendorff's *Aristoteles und Athen* (cited in an appendix), though these works appeared three years before the publication of his treatise.

G. W. B.

It is agreeable to note that Mr. John Dennie's *Rome of To-Day and Yesterday: the Pagan City*, has passed into a third edition (Putnam's, pp. 392), for rarely is so much excellent and instructive archæological matter presented in a style so lucid and so attractive. The work has been carefully revised since its first issue by Messrs. Estes and Lauriat, and is adorned with beautiful illustrations, chiefly after photographs by Signor Anderson, of Rome.